APR-18-1993 01:06 FROM IRA SACHS TO 13593940 P.01

S/035/012

4/18/93

DOGM

JOELLE BURNS

1 COPY PLS WAYNE HEDBERG

DOGM

PH 538-5340 F-359-3940

THE CONTINUING SAGA ——————

AIRPORT PROJECT

TRUCKING - VS. - RAILROAD

FAX TRANSMITTAL SHEET

PLEASE NOTE: IF YOUR NAME APPEARS ON THE LIST BELOW, THIS MESSAGE IS FOR YOU. INTERESTED PARTIES IN THE SALT LAKE AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION PROJECT. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, OR HAVE QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE:

(801) 649-9865 Or mobile number (801) 640-0102

ACKERLIND, CURTIS; SLAA COB	F # 801-575-2679	P # 801-581-1444
ADAMS, JOE; UPRR	F # 402-271-4048	P # 402-271-5000
ALBERT, MITCHEL; AD-U.S. SEN	F # 202-224-8062	P # 202-224-5344
BANKS, BARRY; WFRC	F # 801-299-5724	P # 801-292-4469
BERG, LINDA; DES NEWS	F # 802-237-2121	P # 801-237-2100
BELDEN, SCOTT	F # 801-359-3625	P # 801-322-0182
BELGER, MONTY, FAA	F # 202-267-5289	P # 202-267-8111
BENNETT, U.S. SEN, ROBERT	F # 202-224-6717	P # 202-224-3121
BRADLEY, SLCO. COMM JIM	F # 801-468-3535	P # 801-486-3350
BROWN, ROBIN, EPA	F # 202-260-0451	P # 202-260-5575
BROWNER, CAROL; EPA	F # 202-260-5155	P # 202-260-4700
CORDNER, BURNELL; UT AIR QLTY	F # 801-536-4099	P # 801-563-4022
CORDINI, MAYOR DEEDEE	F # 801-535-7551	P # 801-535-7704
CUMMING, ANNETTE; SLAA BRD	F # 801-524-1751	P # 801-521-1044
DAVIDSON, RICHARD; PRES. UPRR	F # 402-271-4048	P # 402-271-4000
DAVIS, JOHN; ATTY	F # 801-531-8468	P # 801-531-8446
DELOACH, DAN; EPA WASH	F # 202-260-4372	P # 202-260-5663
DESPAIN, BOB; EPA DEN	F # 303-293-1647	P # 303-293-1701
GARZA, PAUL; SLAA ENG/MNT	F # 801-575-2680	P # 801-575-2440
GENOVA, JOHN; MER AGGR	F # 303-694-4220	P # 303-694-3030
GILLINO, MARTY; DOT INSP GEN	F # 202-366-3714	P # 800-424-9071
GRANO, DOUG; EPA	F # 919-541-0804	P # 919-541-2350
HANSEN, U.S. REP JAMES	F # 801-621-7946	P # 801-451-5822
HARDISON, ANNE; FAA WASH	F # 202-260-8279	P # 202-260-7960
HARPIST, TIM; SLC TRNS DPT	F # 801-535-6019	P # 801-535-6630
HATCH, U.S.SEN ORRIN	F # 202-224-6331	P # 202-224-3121
HITTI, STEVE; EPA AIR QLTY MNT	F # 919-541-0804	P # 919-541-0886
HOFFMAN, CATHRINE; SLPWO	F # 801-535-6019	P # 801-535-6630
HOLLINGHERST, JOHN; KSL TV NEWS	F # 801-575-5560	P # 801-575-5500
HOGEL, HOUCK; SLCW & RR	F # 801-355-4514	P # 801-322-3429
HORIUCHI, SLCO COMM RANDY	F # 801-468-3535	P # 801-486-3350
HOUCK, JEFF; EPA	F # 303-293-1229	P # 303-293-1766
HOWICK, JODI; ASST SLS ATTRY	F # 801-535-7640	P # 801-535-7788
JOHNSON, BARBARA; FAA DEN	F # 303-286-5539	P # 303-286-5533
JOHNSON, CHARLIE; GOV OFF	F # 801-538-1528	P # 801 538 1514
JOHNSON, LLOYD; ROB & SCH	F # 801-364-0909	P # 801-364-0900
JORDAN, BRUCE; EPA DIR	F # 919-541-0072	P # 919-541-5571
KRUSE, MIKE; UPRR	F # 402-271-5861	P # 402-271-5445
LEAVITT, GOV MIKE	F # 801-538-1528	P # 801-538-1514

PLEASE CONTINUE TO PAGE 2...

FAX TRANSMITTAL
PAGE 2; TO INTERESTED PARTIES IN THE SALT LAKE AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION PROJECT.

LOH, DR. GENE; GOV OFF SC/TECH	F # 801-581-1328	P # 801-581-5505
LYNCH, JAY; UPRR	F # 801-595-3554	P # 801-595-3526
MATHIS, PETER; KTVX, GM	F # 801-973-4440	P # 801-973-4444
MAYRE, DOUG-INTR ENG AIRPORT @ SALT LAKE	F # 206-453-5179	P # 206-455-3555
MAYNE, EDDIE; AFL-CIO	F # 801-575-2813	P # 801-575-2812
MAXWELL, MARVIN; UT AIR QLTY	F # 801-972-9344	P # 801-972-2771
McGINTY, KATIE; WH ES ENVT QLTY	F # 801-536-4099	P # 801-536-8082
MICHELLE, KYLE; V.P. GORE'S OFF	F # 202-456-6225	P # 202-456-6225
MILLER, LOUIS; SLAA	F # 202-456-7044	P # 202-456-6772
MONTOGERY, RANDY; SKI UTAH	F # 801-575-2297	P # 801-575-2900
MOORE, JOE; WVC	F # 801-521-3722	P # 801-534-1779
ORTON ,U.S. REP, BILL	F # 801-966-8435	P # 801-966-3600
OVERSON, COMM BRENT SLCO	F # 202-226-1203	P # 801-379-2309
PENA,FEDERICO; DOT, SEC.	F # 801-468-3535	P # 801-468-3340
PICKARD, LYNNE; FAA WASH	F # 202-366-7202	P # 202-366-4000
RAY, CALVIN; MERID. AGG	F # 202-267-5257	P # 202-267-3263
REICHERT, MIKE; UT AIR QLTY	F # 307-638-3916	P # 307-638-3582
ROAM, ARMOUND; FAA DEN	F # 801-536-4099	P # 801-536-4086
ROGERS, DORTHY; UT AIR QLTY	F # 303-283-5339	P # 303-286-5533
SADLER, TERRY; SLC HEALTH	F # 801-536-4099	P # 801-536-4066
SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL; ALL MBRS	F # 801-534-4502	P # 801-534-4510
SHAPIRO, MIKE; EPA-AIR	F # 801-535-7651	P # 801-535-7600
SHEA, PAT; SLAA BOARD	F # 202-260-5155	P # 202-260-7400
SHEPARD, HON KAREN; U.S. CNGRS	F # 801-359-9901	P # 801-359-9940
SKAGGS, DON; SLAA BOARD	F # 202-226-0354	P # 202-224-3121
SMITH, CHRIS; SL TRIB	F # 801-261-1580	P # 801-261-4400
SPARKS, CRAIG; FAA DEN	F # 801-521-9418	P # 801-280-6379
STEINER, RICHARD; SLAA BOARD	F # 303-286-5430	P # 303-286-5538
STROUD, MIKE; CENTENIAL ENGNRG	F # 801-363-5680	P # 801-355-6822
SWARTZ, LUCY; CNCL ENVRO QLTY	F # 801-268-2736	P # 801-268-9805
THOMAS, DAVE; FAA WASH	F # 302 395-3744	P # 202-395-5754
WALLACH, LARRY; EPA AARM	F # 202-267-5738	P # 202-267-8111
WARREN, LARRY; KUTV	F # 919-541-5489	P # 919-541-0906
WEIS, ELAINE; SLAA BOARD	F # 801-973-3349	P # 801-973-3300
WELCH, TOM; SLAA BOARD	F # 801-944-0850	P # 801-943-3141
WHITEMAN, LILY; EPA WASH	F # 801-364-7644	P # 801-322-1448
WILSON, WES; EPA DEN	F # 202-260-6011	P # 202-260-3480
WORCH, DICK; FAA WASH	F # 303-293-1647	P # 303-293-1439
ZWICK, CRAIG; EX DRTR UDOT	F # 202-267-5257	P # 202-267-8744
	F # 801-965-4338	P # 801-965-4104

April 14, 1993

Issues regarding Rail Haulage of Material for the Salt Lake Airport Runway 16R-34L Project.

Several issues surround the debate of haulage options with the new runway project. Several groups surround the debate as well, including those who have business interests and those who have community concerns. Several statements from the Salt Lake Airport Authority Engineering Contractors and the Airport Director misrepresent the facts. This writer is anonymous due to ties as a vendor to the Airport Authority, and has no connection as an owner or supplier of rail services or aggregate.

While the writer has great respect for the Airport Director's concerns on this project, and believes there was no stated mandate against rail or conveyor options, a comedy of errors has occurred which resulted in a very obscure playing field. It would be a shame if the Airport Authority, Board Members, Mayor's Office and Community were to proceed with the current contract without considering the following points of information.

Misinformation obscures the pursuit of a WIN-WIN Solution. The study performed by an Airport Authority Engineering Consultant contains many inaccuracies. It is obvious to the most casual reader that the study was committed to the idea of truck haulage before the report was ever written. The following are some of the items misrepresented:

1. In the Executive Summary, item I (Truck), it states: "the analysis indicates that a truck haul operation can be *safely accommodated* within the routes outlined in this document" and that "a truck haul operation would require a maximum of 992 truck trips per day or 62 each-way trips per hour". Yet later in the study, $3,029,166. is identified as calculated accident costs and ***six calculated fatalities*** due to truck haulage (see section 4.4 list of property damage only, possible injury, non-incapacitating injury, incapacitating injury and fatalities). At times the Airport Director manipulates "truck trips per hour" by giving the number of round-trips which identifies only the trucks going in one direction, and does not count the additional trucks going the other direction (an equal number of trucks). <u>There are some contradictions here.</u>

2. In the Executive Summary, item II (Rail), it states that "the rail system could only deliver 90 rail cars per day in each direction", thus "the rail haul operation by itself *could not supply the required amount of material*, and that the overall cost to transport the material by rail would be $49,883,339"

(*approx. $17 Million high*). Rail can exceed the "required amount" of material and cost would be within the project budget (costs would be equal to or not more than $2 Million higher than the current truck alternatives).

3. In the Executive Summary, item III (Conveyor), it states that "the time and cost of obtaining rights-of-way and constructing such a high capacity conveyor system are prohibitive" and that "a conveyor was considered as a part of the rail unloading facility, but was found to be extremely expensive". It is a pity that the airport authority did not investigate the use of right-of-ways already established by the UP&L corridor or the Kern River Gas Pipeline. With enough forethought, cooperation and used conveyor equipment, the Beck Street facilities could have successfully conveyed the entire distance at a reasonable cost.

4. The damage to the highway infrastructure is not adequately or accurately identified in the study. The study assumes *there will be enough revenue from permitting and fuel taxes to pay for damage to the highways. If this projection is not accurate, the state will pay the price, not the contractor.* The Governor's office has asked the Department of Transportation to examine this issue as well as safety concerns (something which should have been requested by the Airport Authority months ago). The last time the DOT performed such a study was at the Vitro Tailings Site, where it was found that rail offered a safer, less damaging solution for the community.

No wonder none of the bidders spent time investigating such options. By the time these gross inaccuracies were discovered, the bids were due and the safer alternatives had not been accurately investigated.

The TRUTH about a RAIL Option.

1. **Description.** The rail option is very legitimate and consists of the following components:

   A. Quarries located in the Tooele and Grantsville areas have adequate reserves and rail access to process and deliver the specified materials for the project. Royalties and rates have been considerably cut by these quarries to improve the cost to a feasible level.

   B. Midwest Rail Company can provide rail cars, yard engines and switching labor to simplify Union Pacific's responsibility.

C. Union Pacific need only provide main-line engines and tracks between the quarries and the unloading site. Union Pacific has verified its ability to run 3 unit trains (70 cars each for a total of 210 cars per day) from the loading point to the unloading point, and has cut its rates as well.

D. Salt Lake & Garfield Railway has offered to build the necessary unloading and staging track required for ease of pick-up and delivery at the unloading site.

E. Unloading of the materials from the rail cars can be accomplished on Salt Lake City Corporation land, and within 600 feet of the airport project. The existing Salt Lake & Garfield Railway line runs along the south-west corner of the I-80 / 40th west interchange, directly across I-80 from the airport project. **NOTE TO MEDIA: IF YOU PHOTOGRAPH NORTH TOWARDS THE AIRPORT FROM JUST SOUTH OF THE PROPOSED RAIL UNLOADING AREA (AS MARKED WITH AN * ON THE ATTACHED "L1" DRAWING), THE PROXIMITY OF RAIL TO THE PROJECT IS VERY TELLING.** The unloading system includes an unloading hopper which holds the dumped contents (100 tons each) of a rail car and feeds onto a series of conveyors. The conveyors would run (as shown on attached drawings provided by a local engineering firm) from the unloading station, over I-80 in a contained tube and continue north 8000 feet to the central area of the project where the material would be dumped into spreading equipment or stored. Used conveying equipment has been located by the engineer for the entire project, which has improved costs and delivery. All conveyors would be covered. The system is sized to accommodate unloading of the trains at 5 hours each, thus delivering 21,000 tons of material into the airport area each day, regardless of weather or road conditions. It is important to note the ability to use this equipment on the next phase of runway construction, which requires the delivery of concrete aggregates. Permits have been applied for with the appropriate state agencies, and have been met with enthusiasm.

The ADVANTAGES of a RAIL Solution.

1. **Safety.** The Denver Airport haulage of materials was slipped by the public in much the same manner as we are seeing here. After the trucks started rolling and the public was subjected to all the problems associated with truck haulage, the program was brought to a screeching halt. The Denver Airport Authority lost critical project time while they regrouped and created an acceptable method of hauling material by rail. The Airport Director's claim last week that the "current UP&L trucking requirements are going smoothly" and are "similar to the proposed trucking plan for the runway expansion" was grossly negligent. The 24 trucks/hr which was stated by Mr. Miller not only

exceeds the actual number of 16 trucks/hr counted during 1 day of observation, but is not comparable to the 6.6 Million Tons (62 trucks/hr) required and stated in the study to do the project. The Director also states on several occasions, that the Environmental Issues have been examined, permitted and covered by the proper agencies, but these agencies do not address safety!

2. **Schedule.** While the schedule for haulage of materials into the airport could be delayed as much as two months in the beginning, the rate at which the material would be delivered by rail to the center of the project exceeds the required amount by 24.5%. The project would be on schedule by the tenth month, less than half way through the construction period. The rail option has the potential of improving the overall schedule of completion, thus providing additional revenue to the Airport Authority.

3. **No damage to infrastructure.** The rail option precludes the use of trucks over highways, thus precluding damage to the highways. Note: Less than 1% of the required material is Topsoil which must be brought from point-of-the-mountain or West Valley City. This material could be brought into the rail unloading facility (accessible via the I-80 / 5600 West interchange) and dumped onto the conveyor by truck. This allows delivery of special materials without bringing trucks into the airport traffic area.

4. **Environmental.** It was eerie the other night to watch the airport director look straight into the TV camera and say "environmental issues are over" and "impacts are insignificant". The Environmental Agencies do not necessarily agree with such a statement. Exhaust and Dust emissions will impact the already critical levels in the valley, and tarps will not contain all dust problems. While rail has diesel emissions, the amounts between the two options are light years away from each other (obviously no figures are available, but such a calculation could be easily performed by the proper agency). Again, SAFETY should also be an environmental issue!

5. **Cost Comparisons.**

   A. Truck Costs which should be considered:
      1. Processing and loading material into trucks at the Quarry
      2. Truck Haulage Costs
      3. Dumping and storage costs

4. Additional costs for increase in accidents and fatalities (The study did not consider the addition of trucks to the highway in an appropriate exponential fashion, but rather in a linear fashion, as pointed out by the Governors Science and Technology Council).
5. Damage to infrastructure.

B. Rail Costs to be considered:
   1. Processing and loading material into rail at the Quarry
   2. Union Pacific Transportation
   3. Midwest Rail Switching
   4. Salt Lake & Garfield Railway Trackage Fee
   5. Unloading and Conveyance Capital Costs ÷ Total Tonnage
   6. Unloading and Conveyance Operating Costs

C. Contractor's previous truck haul bid + or - the differential for rail
   Worst case is W.W. Clyde at $33.6 Million truck bid + $2 Million for rail option (before used equipment was found) = $35.6 Million.
   There is a very high confidence level that the rail costs have come down to a more competitive level which would possibly allow no change in price from truck to rail.

D. Airport Budget = $33 Million vs. Worst Case = $35.6 Million

E. Future projects such as the concrete aggregate delivery into the airport could be served by this system as well and presents an even better cost efficiency when considered.

What Now? The Airport Director, the Airport Authority and the Public's best interests are served by keeping project delays to a minimum. The Airport Director and Airport Authority are currently investigating the low bidder's qualifications as well as issues surrounding the fact that the low bidder is not a Utah Contractor (why do we always give our work away to other states?). During this time of investigation, two important items could be accomplished:

1. Let the bidders have a period of 2-3 weeks to provide a price and schedule for a rail haulage option. The bidders (or a qualified short list thereof) could quickly compare their trucking costs with rail alternatives. This allows the public and the airport authority to see for themselves what a rail option would cost and what the real advantages and disadvantages are. It makes the rail option feasibility a matter of public record. And it allows the bidders to place the rail option on the table without fear of legal action against them (some bidders refused to offer rail after the bids were opened due to such a fear).

2. Allow the DOT to complete a full study of the real infrastructure damage and repair costs, as well as quantification of safety compromises associated with truck haulage.

Knowledge is Power! This effort should empower the authorities and the public to feel good about the pending haulage decisions.

This document has been sent to:

- Senator Orin Hatch
- Mayor Deedee Corridini
- Airport Authority Board Members
- Airport Engineer - Paul Garza
- Governor Mike Leavitt
- DOT Administrator - Craig Zwick
- Airport Director - Lou Miller
- Media

March 8/93 Report from Leavitt Gov. science tech. counsel. [redacted]

UTA

3/8/93

Salt Lake International Airport Haul Study

The part of Centennial Engineering Inc.'s report on the above study that I received did not contain details of the the rail mode. Thus, my comments are based on pages 1 through 34 of the report.

The three impacts considered in the part of the report that I reviewed are:

(a) accident cost
(b) traffic congestion, and
(c) pavement damage

While I appreciate that data limitations and uncertainty about haul routes make it difficult to arrive an reliable estimates of the costs or benefits, there is reason to believe that certain assumptions made in each of the above three cases may have distorted the final conclusion.

[redacted]

Accident Cost Estimation

1. Accident rates in this study are assumed to be a linear function of volume. However, when large vehicles such as those expected to be used in this project enter the traffic stream, the increase in the variance of speed usually tends to increase accident rates almost exponentially.

2. There is no mention of the risk at the entry and exit points from the borrow pits.

If these two items are taken into consideration, the expected cost of accidents would be much higher.

Congestion

The study concludes that in most cases haul vehicles will have no significant impact on traffic congestion. This conclusion is based on a simple comparison of traffic volumes (ADTs) as opposed to a review of existing/expected capacity and level of service. I believe that any impact study should consider these two aspects.

It is also worth noting that trucks merging and diverging at 1 per minute at the crosshair by the airport will have a significant impact depending on the traffic volumes in the major stream. The study has virtually ignored this component.

The delays at the intersections and ramps should have also been examined.

Pavement Damage

There is explanation on how the estimates were derived - est 4-10,000,000

General

Something that seems to have been left out when evaluating the rail option is the long-term benefits of having a spur line to the airport. Many airports in the US and around the world are currently facing ground access problems and are considering such spur lines. If such an opportunity existed at SLCIA, the expected benefits of it should have been set off against the cost of the rail line.
This comment is based on the review of Ira Sachs who has addressed some issues related to the rail option.

Prianka N. Seneviratne, Associate Professor
Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322
Tel. (801) 750-3980; Fax (801) 750-1185